arXiv:1407.1266v3 [physics.gen-ph] 19 Jan 2015

Relic photon temperature versus redshift and the cosmic neutrino background

Ralf Hofmann

Institut für Theoretische Physik
Universität Heidelberg
Philosophenweg 16
69120 Heidelberg, Germany

Abstract

Presuming that CMB photons are described by the deconfining phase of an SU(2) Yang-Mills theory with the critical temperature for the deconfining-preconfining phase transition matching the present CMB temperature $T_0 \sim 2.725\,\mathrm{K}$ ($\mathrm{SU(2)_{CMB}}$), we investigate how CMB temperature T connects with the cosmological scale factor a in a Friedmann-Lemaître-Robertson-Walker Universe. Owing to a violation of conformal scaling at late times, the tension between the (instantaneous) redshift of reionisation from CMB observation ($z_{\rm re} \sim 11$) and quasar spectra ($z_{\rm re} \sim 6$) is repealed. Also, we find that the redshift of CMB decoupling moves from $z_{\rm dec} \sim 1100$ to $z_{\rm dec} \sim 1775$ which questions ΛCDM cosmology at high redshifts. Adapting this model to the conventional physics of three flavours of massless cosmic neutrinos, we demonstrate inconsistency with the value $\mathrm{N_{eff}} \sim 3.36$ extracted from Planck data. Interactions between cosmic neutrinos and the CMB implies a *common* temperature T of (no longer separately conserved) CMB and neutrino fluids. $\mathrm{N_{eff}} \sim 3.36$ then entails a universal, temperature induced cosmic neutrino mass $m_\nu = \xi T$ with $\xi = 3.973$. Our above results on $z_{\rm re}$ and $z_{\rm dec}$, derived from $\mathrm{SU(2)_{CMB}}$ alone, are essentially unaffected when including such a neutrino sector.

1 Introduction

Cosmology has become a science of precision data in all its main experimental branches: large-scale structure surveys, e.g. [1, 2], observations of the cosmic microwave background (CMB), e. g. [3, 4, 5], and use of calibrated standard candles for luminosity distance - redshift measurements, e. g. [6, 7]. Thanks to this fortuitous observational situation, we appear to possess an accurate parametrisation of the Universe's composition, and we understand how the CMB decoupled, what the statistical properties of its temperature fluctuations are, how matter structure grew, and what its late-time effects on the propagation of the CMB are. The present ΛCDM concordance model [8], stating that apart from $\sim 70\%$ dark energy the present Universe is composed of 30% nonrelativistic matter of which about 5.5% is baryonic matter, is an apparently good one. Yet, ΛCDM merely represents a simple parametrisation of cosmological expansion with no definite, falsifiable handle on what the dark sector in it actually represents. Moreover, certain signatures or parameter values, such as the redshift of reionisation or the present value of the Hubble parameter, are at considerable tension [8], and there are degeneracies when exclusively relying on one observational modality. This precludes the use of another modality as an independent check. Finally, the CMB behaves in an anomalous way at large angles [9]: CMB cold spot [10], large-angle suppression of the temperature-temperature (TT) correlation function on the ecliptic north, alignment of low CMB multipoles [11], etc. This startling state of affairs suggests that, in contrast to a highly developed and efficient computational and statistical machinery, our present *theories* of the matter, radiation and dark energy content of the Universe, and therefore of the cosmological model, are incomplete.

In this work we propose a potential improvement of this situation by first addressing the late-time and then the high-redshift consequences of the postulate that photon propagation is, fundamentally, described by a pure SU(2) Yang-Mills theory of scale $\sim 10^{-4}\,\mathrm{eV}$, $\mathrm{SU}(2)_{\mathrm{CMB}}$, see [12] and references therein. In doing so, we will conclude that at low redshift the conventional, conformal scaling law $T = a^{-1}\,T_0$ of the CMB temperature T ($T_0 = 2.725\,\mathrm{K}$ the present CMB temperature; a the cosmological scale factor, defined to be unity at present) is violated. In particular, we obtain $T(a = 1/10) = 6.2\,T_0$ with conformal scaling $T \propto a^{-1}$ essentially being restored for $a < 1/10$. Relying on $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{eff}} \sim 3.36$ [8], this implies consequences for cosmic neutrinos, first addressed by assuming their masslessness and subsequently by invoking a particular mechanism for mass generation by their interaction with the CMB on cosmological time scales.

This report is organised as follows. In the next section we review and explicate properties of deconfining $\mathrm{SU}(2)_{\mathrm{CMB}}$ on the free quasiparticle level which are relevant for cosmology: thermodynamical quantities, evolution of effective gauge coupling, equation of state, and the deconfining-preconfining transition temperature T_c for $\mathrm{SU}(2)_{\mathrm{CMB}}$. We also remark on the thermal photon's polarisation tensor in $\mathrm{SU}(2)_{\mathrm{CMB}}$, representing the by far dominant one-loop correction to free propagation. Apart

from their role in thermalising photons to the temperature of the thermal ground state and its massive quasiparticle excitations, radiative corrections are, however, irrelevant to the cosmological questions addressed in the present work. In Sec. 3 we explore implications of $\mathrm{SU}(2)_{\mathrm{CMB}}$ by studying conservation of its energy in an expanding Friedmann-Lemaître-Robertson-Walker Universe. We find that conformal scaling of T vs. a is violated at low but restored at high redshifts. This resolves the tension between the high and low values of the redshift z_{re} associated with instantaneous reionisation and extracted from CMB data [8] and quasar spectra [13], respectively. On the other hand, the value of redshift z_{dec} for CMB decoupling is increased by a factor ~ 1.6 which challenges the validity of the ΛCDM concordance model at high redshifts. In Sec. 4 we confront $\mathrm{SU}(2)_{\mathrm{CMB}}$ with conventional, massless cosmic neutrinos to conclude that $N_{\mathrm{eff}} = 3.36$ [8] is incompatible with three flavours. This situation changes if neutrinos are assumed to interact with the CMB, thus acquiring the same temperature and a temperature dependent mass. Importantly, such coupling of the neutrino sector to the CMB, motivated by the interpretation of a neutrino as a single center-vortex loop in the confining phase of an SU(2) Yang-Mills theory [14], does not in any essential way change the conclusions of Sec. 3 on the values of z_{re} and z_{dec}. Finally, we present a summary and our conclusions in Sec. 6. We also speculate about changes implied by $\mathrm{SU}(2)_{\mathrm{CMB}}$ and by the thus modified neutrino sector for the matter sector of the cosmological model at high redshift.

This work employs natural units: Boltzmann's constant k_B, the reduced quantum of action $\hbar$, and the speed of light in vacuum c are all set equal to unity.

2 $\mathrm{SU}(2)_{\mathrm{CMB}}$: Thermal ground state plus free quasiparticle excitations

For the reader's convenience we review here results on deconfining SU(2) Yang-Mills thermodynamics relevant to the present work, for more detailed presentations see [12] and references therein.

2.1 Pressure and energy density

In its deconfining phase an SU(2) Yang-Mills theory develops a thermal ground state invoked by spatially coarse-grained Harrington-Shepard calorons and anticalorons [15], that is, temporally periodic instantons of trivial holonomy and topological charge of modulus unity. These field configurations are constructed in singular gauge thanks to a superposition principle for their prepotential discovered in [16]. (Anti)calorons are (anti)selfdual gauge field configurations. As such they exhibit *vanishing* energy density and pressure. Their spatially coarse-grained reincarnation, an adjoint scalar field ϕ, thus is inert. It describes part of the thermal ground state: there are no quantum fluctuations or classically propagating modes of this field.

Fundamentally, propagating gauge field fluctuations, which are (slightly) harder than $|\phi|$, lift the energy density $\rho_{\rm gs}$ of the thermal ground state from zero to

$$\rho_{\rm gs} = 4\pi\Lambda^3 T\,, \tag{1}$$

where Λ denotes the Yang-Mills scale (a free parameter of mass dimension one). After coarse-graining this phenomenon is associated with a simple pure-gauge configuration $a^\mu_{\rm gs}$. For the ground-state pressure $P_{\rm gs}$ one has $P_{\rm gs} = -\rho_{\rm gs}$. Field ϕ implies an adjoint Higgs mechanism. As a consequence, two of the three base directions of the SU(2) Lie algebra become massive while the third one, the direction identified with the photon, remains massless. Namely, in unitary gauge $\phi^a = \delta^{a3}\,|\phi|$ $(a = 1, 2, 3)$ a common mass $m = 2e\sqrt{\frac{\Lambda^3}{2\pi T}}$ emerges for direction 1 and 2 which thus become thermal quasiparticles. Here e is the effective gauge coupling whose temperature dependence is yet to be determined. One can show that the transition from the gauge, where ϕ's dynamics was derived (winding gauge), to unitary gauge transforms the Polyakov loop on $a^\mu_{\rm gs}$ by an electric center jump, meaning that the thermal ground state is $\mathbf{Z}_2$ degenerate. This, in turn, implies the deconfining nature of the thermal ground state. On the level of free quasiparticles (one loop), one obtains the following expressions for the deconfining-phase pressure P and energy density ρ which both are sums of a ground-state and free thermal-fluctuation contributions (free quantum fluctuations are negligibly small):

$$\begin{aligned} P(\lambda) &= -\Lambda^4 \left\{ \frac{2\lambda^4}{(2\pi)^6} \left[2\bar{P}(0) + 6\,\bar{P}(2a) \right] + 2\lambda \right\}\,, \\ \rho(\lambda) &= \Lambda^4 \left\{ \frac{2\lambda^4}{(2\pi)^6} \left[2\bar{\rho}(0) + 6\,\bar{\rho}(2a) \right] + 2\lambda \right\}\,, \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{P}(y) &\equiv \int_0^\infty dx\, x^2\, \log\left[1 - \exp(-\sqrt{x^2+y^2}) \right]\,, \\ \bar{\rho}(y) &\equiv \int_0^\infty dx\, x^2 \frac{\sqrt{x^2+y^2}}{\exp(\sqrt{x^2+y^2}) - 1}\,, \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

$$a \equiv \frac{m}{2T}\,, \tag{4}$$

and $\lambda \equiv \frac{2\pi T}{\Lambda}$. One may wonder why the contribution of the massless mode (referred to as γ in the following) is thermalised to the same temperature T as the tightly ground-state coupled massive, propagating fields (Higgs mechanism!), in the following referred to as $V^\pm$. (No coupling between γ and $V^\pm$ takes place on the level of Eq. (2).) To understand this, the results of [17] are required where radiative corrections to the pressure are computed. While two-loop corrections generally rise with a lower power in T than four, the γ-$V^\pm$ 2-loop diagram with a single four-vertex represents an exception. This two-loop diagram *is* $\propto T^4$ and thus induces

a weak coupling between γ and $V^{\pm}$ for all temperatures in the deconfining phase. (The critical temperature T_c for the deconfining-preconfining phase transition is not really an exception because there γ starts to acquire an effective mass by tunneling between the deconfining and preconfining ground states [18].) Notably on cosmological time scales one thus is assured that γ and $V^{\pm}$ are thermalised to one and the same temperature. The (negative) contribution of this particular radiative correction was exploited in [19] to infer the density of invisible magnetic monopoles and antimonopoles, liberated by rare (anti)caloron dissociation due to large holonomy shifts [20, 21, 22, 23]. Effectively but weakly, this reduces the photon temperature. For our present purposes we may safely ignore this tiny effect (fraction of a per mille) [19].

2.2 Effective gauge coupling

P and ρ in Eq. (2) depend on the effective gauge coupling e via the $V^{\pm}$ mass m, given as $m = 2e\sqrt{\frac{\Lambda^3}{2\pi T}}$ or $\frac{m}{2T} \equiv a = 2\pi e \lambda^{-3/2}$. To determine $e(\lambda)$, one thus requires $\lambda(a)$ or $a(\lambda)$. Thermodynamical consistency of the expressions in Eq. (2), is equivalent to $\lambda(a)$ obeying the following first-order ordinary differential equation

$$\partial_a \lambda = -\frac{24\lambda^4 a}{(2\pi)^6} \frac{D(2a)}{1 + \frac{24\lambda^3 a^2}{(2\pi)^6} D(2a)}\,, \tag{5}$$

whose solution $\lambda(a)$ can be inverted to $a(\lambda)$ because

$$D(y) \equiv \int_0^\infty dx\, \frac{x^2}{\sqrt{x^2+y^2}}\, \frac{1}{\exp(\sqrt{x^2+y^2}) - 1} > 0\,, \qquad (y \geq 0)\,. \tag{6}$$

There is an attractor solution to Eq. (5) which predicts a plateau at high temperatures, $e = \sqrt{8}\pi$, and critical behaviour $e \propto -\log(\lambda - \lambda_c)$ just above $\lambda_c = 13.87$. Fig. 1 depicts function $e(\lambda)$. Because of the constancy of e at high temperatures the $V^{\pm}$ mass m drops like $\propto 1/\sqrt{T}$ as temperature rises. At sufficiently high temperatures we are thus facing a gas of $2 + 2 \times 3 = 8$ (3 polarisations for $V^{\pm}$) relativistic degrees of freedom. (The ground state contributions to energy density and pressure are only linearly rising in temperature. Thus they can be neglected at high temperatures.)

Strictly speaking, given a temperature T, thermodynamics takes place on the one-loop level only: small radiative corrections to the free quasiparticle pressure are usually thermodynamically inconsistent in the sense that they do not obey the usual Legendre transformations. However, because a particular radiative correction to the pressure, mentioned in Sec. 2.1, is $\propto T^4$ the associated decrease in the pressure of free and massless thermal fluctuations (photons), introduced by a slight drop of temperature, can be interpreted as a decrease in photonic energy density related to that of the pressure by a Legendre transformation [19].



Figure 1: Temperature dependence of effective coupling e. For $\lambda \searrow \lambda_c \equiv 13.78$ one has $e \propto -\log(\lambda - \lambda_c)$ while e rapidly approaches the plateau $e = \sqrt{8\pi}$ as λ increases away from λ_c.

2.3 Equation of state

Let us now investigate how rapidly the parameter κ in a presumed equation of state[1] of the form $P = \kappa\rho$ approaches that of a thermal gas of massless particles of deconfining SU(2) Yang-Mills thermodynamics as temperature increases away from T_c. Fig. 2 depicts κ as a function of T/T_c. Already for $\frac{T}{T_c} \geq 4$ the equation of state is very close to that of a gas of free and massless particles ($P = \frac{1}{3}\rho$): $\frac{T}{T_c} = 4$ corresponds to $\kappa = \frac{P}{\rho} = 0.3201$ and $\frac{T}{T_c} = 6.2$ to $\kappa = \frac{P}{\rho} = 0.3297$.

2.4 Value of T_c for $\mathbf{SU(2)_{CMB}}$

The strongest indication that T_c of $\mathrm{SU}(2)_{\mathrm{CMB}}$, the Yang-Mills theory postulated to fundamentally describe photon physics, essentially coincides with the present temperature $T_0 = 2.725\,\mathrm{K}$ [3] of the CMB arises from observations of the so-called cosmic radio background, also dubbed *unexplained extragalactic emission*, see [24] and references therein or for a recent analysis [25]. In [18] the bump of spectral power, which exhibits a strong deviation from the quadratic dependence on frequency of the Planckian blackbody spectral radiance within the Rayleigh-Jeans regime, was interpreted as a re-shuffling effect of spectral power due to very low-frequency modes becoming evanescent: A Meissner induced, effective photon mass m_γ induces a spectrum of standing waves at very low frequencies[2], assuming its maximum at zero. Modelling this in terms of a Gaussian shape, we extract the feeble value of present, effective photon mass of $m_\gamma \sim 100\,\mathrm{MHz}$. Here the term *effective* photon mass refers

[1] By definition, the actual equation $P = P(\rho)$ of state, $P(\rho)$ being a nonlinear function, exhibits no explicit T dependence, see also Sec. 3.1.

[2] At T_c *electric* (and unresolved) monopoles and antimonopoles [19] start to condense [12], indicating the onset of dynamical breaking of the so far unbroken U(1) gauge symmetry in the deconfining phase.



Figure 2: Ratio of pressure and energy density, or equation-of-state parameter κ, as a function of T/T_c in the deconfining phase of SU(2) Yang-Mills thermodynamics. Note the rapid approach to the behaviour of a thermal gas of free and massless particles ($P = \frac{1}{3}\,\rho$).

to the fact that the present Universe does not exhibit a homogeneous monopole condensate but rather is characterised by alternating spatial patches of deconfining and preconfining ground states which tunnel into one another. The quantity m_γ thus represents an average over many of these patches, and there is not yet a (stable) third polarisation of the photon. Due to a critical increase of m_γ when lowering T away from T_c such a small value for m_γ implies that, practically, the present temperature $T_0 = 2.725\,\mathrm{K}$ of the CMB coincides with T_c. This determines the Yang-Mills scale Λ of $\mathrm{SU}(2)_{\mathrm{CMB}}$ as $\Lambda = \frac{2\pi T_0}{\lambda_c} = \frac{2\times 2.725\pi}{13.87}\,\mathrm{K} = 1.234\,\mathrm{K}$.

2.5 Remark on polarisation tensor of thermal photon

In [12, 26, 27] $\mathrm{SU}(2)_{\mathrm{CMB}}$ predictions, arising from a nontrivial photon polarisation tensor $\Pi_{\mu\nu}$, for thermal photon propagation (transverse part) and the induction of magnetic charge density waves (longitudinal part) at low temperatures and frequencies are given. Briefly, the transverse part of $\Pi_{\mu\nu}$ induces a screening-antiscreening modification of the low frequency part of the spectral, thermal energy density, in turn predicting the emergence of cosmologically local temperature depressions (redshift $z \sim 1$). This is a manifestation of dynamical statistical isotropy (and spatial homogeneity) breaking, exhibited through the temperature gradient seen by an observer located within a given depression. The longitudinal part repesents a cut off spectrum of longitudinally propagating, thermalised magnetic field modes in various branches [28]. To turn these into a magnetic field, coherent on cosmological length scales, requires a break of spatial homogeneity (local temperature gradient), as provided by the transverse part of $\Pi_{\mu\nu}$. This scenario, worth exploring in more detail, could yield a viable, unified description of the CMB large-angle anomalies (transverse part of $\Pi_{\mu\nu}$) [4, 9, 11] and the emergence of intergalactic magnetic fields

(longitudinal part of $\Pi_{\mu\nu}$, coherence assisted by transverse part), both constituting late-time phenomena ($z \sim 1$). For what follows, small radiative corrections, such as described by $\Pi_{\mu\nu}$, are (and safely can be) neglected.

3 Low-z and high-z scaling of CMB temperature in $\mathrm{SU(2)_{CMB}}$

In this section we explore more basic cosmological consequences of $\mathrm{SU(2)_{CMB}}$ than those related to the polarisation tensor $\Pi_{\mu\nu}$ discussed in Sec.2.5. Namely, we ask what the implications are of Secs. 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, and 2.4 for (i) the dependence of CMB temperature T on the cosmological scale factor, (ii) the cosmological evolution of $\mathrm{SU(2)_{CMB}}$ energy density compared to that of a conventional photon gas, (iii) a resolution of the tension between the redshift value z_{re} of instantaneous reionisation as extracted from the CMB TT angular power spectrum and Baryon Acoustic Oscillations (BAO) ($z_{\mathrm{re}} = 11.3 \pm 1$) on one hand [5, 8] and the detection/non-detection of the Gunn-Peterson trough in high-redshift quasar spectra ($z_{\mathrm{re}} \sim 6$) on the other hand [13], and (iv) the value of redshift z_{dec} at CMB decoupling and the present cosmological concordance model at high redshift.

3.1 Energy conservation in an expanding Universe

We start by assuming $\mathrm{SU(2)_{CMB}}$ to be a separately conserved cosmic fluid, stretched by the expansion of a Friedmann-Lemaître-Robertson-Walker Universe. The latter is characterised by the scale factor a which we normalise to unity at present: $a(T_0) \equiv a_0 = 1$. In exclusively discussing the evolution of the CMB subsequent to decoupling, no specific cosmological model is required. In particular, no assumption on the Universe's spatial curvature needs to be made. Separate conservation of $\mathrm{SU(2)_{CMB}}$ predicts interesting consequences for reionisation and CMB decoupling which are modified when this assumption is relaxed. This is done in Sec. 5 where we postulate the cosmic neutrino background to be conserved together with $\mathrm{SU(2)_{CMB}}$ only. Interestingly, however, there are no essential modifications of these predictions under such an extension of $\mathrm{SU(2)_{CMB}}$.

Let ρ and P denote energy density and pressure of $\mathrm{SU(2)_{CMB}}$, respectively. The equation of energy conservation reads

$$\frac{d\rho}{da} = -\frac{3}{a}(P + \rho)\,. \tag{7}$$

To solve Eq. (7) for $\rho(a)$, an equation of state $P = P(\rho)$ and a boundary condition $\rho^* = \rho(a^*)$ need to be prescribed. The former is obtained by solving $\rho = \rho(T)$ for $T = T(\rho)$ to be substituted into $P = P(T)$. The choice of initial condition is explained in Sec. 3.2.



Figure 3: $SU(2)_{CMB}$ induced violation of (conformal) U(1) scaling of CMB temperature T with inverse scale factor a^{-1}. Left panel: $\frac{T_0}{T}$ as a function of scale factor a for $SU(2)_{CMB}$ (dashed line) and for the conventional U(1) theory (solid line). Right panel: $\frac{T}{T_0} \times a$ as a function of scale factor a for $SU(2)_{CMB}$. Note saturation of $\frac{T}{T_0} \times a$ to the value 0.62 for $a < 1/10$.

3.2 Temperature vs. scale factor and energy density of $SU(2)_{CMB}$

We would like to derive an $SU(2)_{CMB}$ prediction for $(T_0/T)(a)$. To do this, the initial temperature T^* (and hence energy density $\rho(T^*)$) is chosen such that, with a prescribed value $a^* < 1$ and using $T = T(\rho(a))$, the evolution $\rho(a)$ generates the value $(T_0/T) = 1$ at $a(T_0) = 1$ (today). Prescribing $a^* = 1/10$, one obtains $T^* = 6.2\,T_0$, see left panel in Fig. 3. Judging from the results of Sec. 2.3 and by saturation of $\frac{T}{T_0} \times a$ for $a < 1/10$ (right panel of Fig. 3), it is safe to (conformally) scale T with a^{-1} for $a < 1/10$. This is also expressed by the fact that the constant term 0.62 in fits of $\frac{T}{T_0} \times a$ to polynomials in a is stable under variations of the fit interval, contained in $\frac{1}{20} \leq a \leq 1$, and the polynomial degree. Thus we have

$$T = 0.62\, a^{-1} \times T_0\,, \qquad (a \leq \frac{1}{10})\,. \tag{8}$$

Eq. (8) and Fig. 3 state that for $a < 1$ the conformal scaling

$$T = a^{-1} \times T_0 \tag{9}$$

over-estimates the *actual* CMB temperature if it is $SU(2)_{CMB}$ that describes CMB photons correctly. Heuristically, this is a consequence of the fact that $SU(2)_{CMB}$ energy density ρ, chiefly residing in relativistic degress of freedom at high redshift, is not only reduced by spacetime growth, as in the conventional U(1) theory, but also by an investment into thermal ground-state structure and quasiparticle mass m. Recall that the former generates the latter by an increasingly efficient, adjoint Higgs mechanism as temperature drops towards T_c (or T_0), see Fig. 2.

Eq. (8) implies the ratio R_ρ of energy density ρ in $\mathrm{SU}(2)_{\mathrm{CMB}}$ to energy density $\rho_\gamma = \frac{\pi^2}{15} T^4$ of a conventional photon gas to be

$$R_\rho \equiv \frac{\rho}{\rho_\gamma} = 0.591 \qquad (a \leq \frac{1}{10}) \,. \tag{10}$$

Thus, although at high temperatures ($a \leq \frac{1}{10}$) $\mathrm{SU}(2)_{\mathrm{CMB}}$ possesses four times as many relativistic degrees of freedom as the conventional U(1) theory, its energy density ρ is considerably smaller than ρ_γ. Based on Eq. (8), we present in Sec. 3.3 observational evidence that, indeed, $\mathrm{SU}(2)_{\mathrm{CMB}}$ appears to yield a better description of the CMB than conventional U(1) theory.

3.3 The issue of early reionisation

Due to nonlinear structure growth at late times hydrogen gas is compacted under gravitational pull, and stars come into being. Due to their radiation, the Universe's intergalactic medium suffers reionisation. A priori, there is no compelling reason why on cosmological time scales this process should *not* be considered instantaneous: The large-scale *distribution* of galaxies is homogeneous, and so, statistically speaking, each given and sufficiently large region of space experiences ionisation of its hydrogen like any other region of similar extent does. This should preclude sizable retardation effects. Observationally, cosmologically instantaneous reionisation is supported by the rapid transition in the z dependence of quasar spectra. In [13] a moderate resolution Keck spectroscopy of quasars at $z = 5.82, 5.99, 6.28$, discovered by the Sloan Digital Sky Survey (SDSS), was performed. While the two objects with $z = 5.82, 5.99$ do not exhibit the Gunn-Peterson trough, the object of highest redshift $z = 6.28$ cleary does so, suggesting that reionisation indeed is a rapid transition occuring at $z_{\mathrm{re}} \sim 6$. On the other hand, the latest value of a CMB based (WMAP and Planck) and Baryon Acoustic Oscillations (BAO) supported extraction of z_{re} for instantaneous reionisation is $z_{\mathrm{re}} \sim 11.3 \pm 1.1$, see Table 10 (last column) of [5] or Table 5 (last column) of [8]. Thus there is obvious tension between the results for z_{re} from quasar spectra and those extracted from the CMB (plus BAO).

Let us now address this discrepancy. Quasar light propagates with energy densities orders of magnitude higher than that of the CMB. Hypothetically equating such energy densities with ρ of $\mathrm{SU}(2)_{\mathrm{CMB}}$, high fictitious temperatures T would arise, $T \gg T_0$. But at such high temperatures the mean photon energy is just conformally redshifted as in the conventional U(1) theory. As a consequence, $z_{\mathrm{re}} \sim 6$ of [13] should be trusted at face value as a *physical* redshift for instantaneous reionisation: $z_{\mathrm{re}} = 6 \Rightarrow a_{\mathrm{re}}^{-1} = 7$.

We now test the validity of $\mathrm{SU}(2)_{\mathrm{CMB}}$ by appealing to the conventional assumption of conformal U(1) scaling as in Eq. (9) to deduce the hypothetical value of T_{re} associated with $z_{\mathrm{re}} = 6$. This assumption is underlying past and present CMB analysis, and in particular, the extraction of redshift for instantaneous reionisation in [8]. According to Eq. (9) and accepting $z_{\mathrm{re}} = 6$ as physical, we conclude that

$T_{\rm re} = 7 \times T_0$. But if nature indeed realises $\mathrm{SU}(2)_{\rm CMB}$ then this value of $T_{\rm re}$ would, according to Eq. (8) translate into

$$a_{\rm re} = 0.62\,\frac{T_0}{T_{\rm re}} = 0.0886 \quad \Rightarrow \quad z_{\rm re} = a_{\rm re}^{-1} - 1 = 10.29\,. \tag{11}$$

Within errors the thus determined value of $z_{\rm re} = 10.29$ is consistent with $z_{\rm re} \sim 11.3 \pm 1.1$ obtained from combined (conventional) CMB and BAO analysis (Planck plus WMAP, high l and BAO) [8]. Using the Planck data alone and invoking gravitational lensing, a somewhat lower value of $z_{\rm re}$, subject to larger errors, was obtained by the Planck collaboration [8]: $z_{\rm re} = 10.8 \pm^{3.1}_{2.5}$. Again, this is consistent with Eq. (11). Reasoning in this way, the discrepancy in the values of $z_{\rm re}$ is suggested to arise due to incorrect conformal U(1) scaling of CMB temperature when nature actually realises $\mathrm{SU}(2)_{\rm CMB}$.

It is worth mentioning that the $\mathrm{SU}(2)_{\rm CMB}$ value of $T_{\rm re}$ is $T_{\rm re} = 4.35 \times T_0 = 11.85\,\mathrm{K}$. In Sec. 4 we will see that corrections to Eq. (11) due to (unconventional) neutrino physics are not severe.

3.4 Redshift at CMB decoupling

The CMB decoupling temperature $T_{\rm dec}$ of about $T_{\rm dec} = 3000\,\mathrm{K}$ (for our purposes it is sufficient to assume that recombination and CMB decoupling occur instantaneously and simultaneously) is unaffected[3] by $\mathrm{SU}(2)_{\rm CMB}$. According to Eq. (8) $T_{\rm dec}$ translates into a redshift $z_{\rm dec}$ at decoupling of

$$z_{\rm dec} = \frac{1}{0.62}\,\frac{3000}{2.725} - 1 = 1775\,. \tag{12}$$

This is substantially larger than the conventional value of $z_{\rm dec} \sim 1100$ [8] and should have an impact on cosmological parameter values, notably matter density[4] and the Hubble parameter, H_0. A detailed investigation of this important problem is well beyond the scope of the present work.

4 Massless neutrinos?

4.1 Adaption of standard treatment of neutrino temperature to $\mathrm{SU}(2)_{\rm CMB}$

To start with, let us assume that neutrinos are massless and that there is no coupling between $\mathrm{SU}(2)_{\rm CMB}$ and the neutrino sector such that they represent separately

[3] This value of $T_{\rm dec}$ is a consequence of the ionisation energy of hydrogen, $E_{\rm ion} = 13.6\,\mathrm{eV}$, and the Saha equation.

[4] Owing to $\mathrm{SU}(2)_{\rm CMB}$, matter density in the conventional concordance model is at CMB decoupling $\left(\frac{1775}{1100}\right)^3 \sim 4.2$ times higher facing the same conventional photon pressure.

conserved cosmic fluids. The standard argument of a conserved entropy density in the process of e^+e^- annihilation produces a ratio of neutrino temperature T_ν to CMB temperature T of

$$\frac{T_\nu}{T} = \left(\frac{g_1}{g_0}\right)^{1/3} , \tag{13}$$

where g_0 (g_1) denotes the number of relativistic degrees of freedom before (after) e^+e^- annihilation. In the conventional theory one has: $g_0 = 2 + \frac{7}{8}\,4$ and $g_1 = 2$ such that $\frac{T_\nu}{T} = \left(\frac{4}{11}\right)^{1/3}$. If we replace the conventional U(1) photon theory by $\mathrm{SU(2)_{CMB}}$ then $g_0 = 8 + \frac{7}{8}\,4$ and $g_1 = 8$ which yields

$$\frac{T_\nu}{T} = \left(\frac{g_1}{g_0}\right)^{1/3} = \left(\frac{16}{23}\right)^{1/3} . \tag{14}$$

4.2 $\mathbf{N_{eff} \sim 3.36}$ and separately conserved fluids of massless neutrinos

As we have seen in Sec. 3.2, it is safe to consider conventional, conformal scaling of T versus a^{-1} for $a \leq 1/10$. Recall that $a = 1/10$ corresponds to $T = 6.2\,T_0$. Based on $\mathrm{SU(2)_{CMB}}$ the effective number of neutrino flavours $N_{\rm eff}$ at $T = T_0$, as judged by the conventional theory in terms of the actual number of massless neutrino flavours N_ν, reads (total energy density in relativistic degrees of freedom minus energy density in photons divided by conventional energy density per massless neutrino flavour)

$$N_{\rm eff} = \frac{\frac{7}{8}\,N_\nu (0.62)^4 \left(\frac{16}{23}\right)^{4/3}}{\frac{7}{8}\left(\frac{4}{11}\right)^{4/3}} . \tag{15}$$

Note that $\mathrm{SU(2)_{CMB}}$ effects creep into the numerator of Eq. (15) in terms of the factors $(0.62)^4$, related to the fact that T_ν of massless neutrinos always follows the conventional scaling law $T_\nu \propto a^{-1}$ while there are low-redshift violations thereof for T, and $\left(\frac{16}{23}\right)^{4/3}$, arising due to eight instead of two relativistic degrees of freedom in $\mathrm{SU(2)_{CMB}}$ during e^+e^- annihilation (Sec. 4.1), deviating from unity and from $\left(\frac{4}{11}\right)^{4/3}$, respectively. For $N_\nu = 3$ [29] we have $N_{\rm eff} = 1.053$ which is far off[5] the observationally determined value of $N_{\rm eff} \sim 3.36$ [8].

Interestingly, the value of $N_{\rm eff}$ depends on the redshift at which it is determined. For example, one obtains for $a < 1/10$

$$N_{\rm eff} = \frac{\frac{7}{8}\,N_\nu \left(\frac{16}{23}\right)^{4/3} + 3}{\frac{7}{8}\left(\frac{4}{11}\right)^{4/3}} . \tag{16}$$

[5]If the (dimensionless) ground-state energy density of $\mathrm{SU(2)_{CMB}}$, $T_0^{-4}\rho_{\rm gs}(T_0) = 32\pi^4\lambda_c^{-3}$, is added to the numerator of Eq. (15) then one obtains $N_{\rm eff} = 6.2$. Clearly, this is also out of range. However, since (modulo small evanescence effects [18]) CMB photons decouple from their ground state at T_0 the ground-state part of $\mathrm{SU(2)_{CMB}}$ at present should be viewed as a (tiny) contribution to dark energy rather than dark radiation. Therefore, we do not in the following consider $\rho_{\rm gs}(T_0)$ anymore when inferring $N_{\rm eff}$ from $\mathrm{SU(2)_{CMB}}$ and neutrino physics at present.

For $N_\nu = 3$ we would have $N_{\rm eff} = 20.33$ instead of the value $N_{\rm eff} = 1.053$ extracted at present. From now on we associate $N_{\rm eff}$ with its value today.

5 CMB thermalised neutrinos

The results of Sec. 4.2 do suggest that $\mathrm{SU}(2)_{\rm CMB}$ and conventional neutrino physics are not compatible. Note that this extends to the case of neutrinos with fixed masses since the latter would reduce rather than enhance their contribution to the Universe's present energy density. Guided by results on how an SU(2) center-vortex responds to environmental conditions (putting forward an effective scale of resolution) [14, 32] a bold suggestion on how to circumvent these difficulties is to assume that a given neutrino flavour is represented by a single center vortex loop of a respective SU(2) Yang-Mills theory and that this theory underwent its preconfing-confining phase transition well before CMB decoupling. Due to its extendedness and (after an electric-magnetically dual interpretation) its unit of *electric* center flux such a center-vortex loop interacts with the CMB. As a consequence, neutrino temperature T_ν and CMB temperature T would coincide: $T_\nu = T$ or $\left(\frac{16}{23}\right)^{1/3} \to 1$ in Eq. (13). Also, no additional split of T_ν and T at low z due to a violation of conformal scaling in the photonic sector alone would occur.

5.1 The case of massless neutrinos

Because it is technically simpler let us first assume that neutrinos, due to their interactions with the CMB, exhibit the same temperature, $T_\nu = T$, but that they remain massless. In this idealisation Eq. (15) modifies as

$$N_{\rm eff} = \frac{\frac{7}{8}\, N_\nu}{\frac{7}{8}\left(\frac{4}{11}\right)^{4/3}}\,. \tag{17}$$

With $N_\nu = 3$ one obtains $N_{\rm eff} = 11.56$ which is much too high. To reduce $N_{\rm eff}$ down to its physical value $N_{\rm eff} = 3.36$ neutrinos need to acquire mass through interactions with the CMB.

5.2 Temperature dependent neutrino mass

Due to an SU(2) center vortex loop possessing electromagnetic properties only, it exclusively interacts with the photonic part of $\mathrm{SU}(2)_{\rm CMB}$. Modulo radiative corrections, which are inessential for the present discusssion, the thermal photon gas in $\mathrm{SU}(2)_{\rm CMB}$ is characterised by the single scale T. Thus, the response of the neutrino sector in terms of neutrino mass emergence must be such that $m_\nu = \xi\, T$ where ξ is a dimensionless constant of order unity. For cosmic neutrinos we assume m_ν to be universal, that is, flavour independent. We have given arguments in [26] on the viability of such a universal, temperature dependent neutrino mass in view of

the overclosure bound of $\sim 15\,\mathrm{eV}$, see [30]. Namely, for $0 \leq \xi \leq 10$ this bound is evaded up to $z \sim 10^4$ which is well before CMB decoupling. On the other hand, lower bounds for the sum of neutrino masses of the order $10^{-1}\,\mathrm{eV}$ [31], posed by the two scenari of mass hierarchy (normal and inverted) to explain neutrino oscillations, are invalid for the here proposed temperature dependent mass of cosmic neutrinos because they refer to neutrino environments which are largely disparate from the CMB (neutrino generation and propagation in long baseline reactor, atmospheric, and solar neutrino experiments).

With a universal, cosmic neutrino mass $m_\nu = \xi T$ the pressure P_ν and energy density ρ_ν is given as (2 spin orientations per flavour)

$$\begin{aligned} P_\nu &= N_\nu T^4 \frac{1}{\pi^2} \int_0^\infty dx\, x^2 \log(1 + \exp(-\sqrt{x^2+\xi^2})) \equiv N_\nu T^4\, \hat{P}_\nu(\xi)\,, \\ \rho_\nu &= N_\nu T^4 \frac{1}{\pi^2} \int_0^\infty dx\, \frac{x^2\sqrt{x^2+\xi^2}}{1+\exp\sqrt{x^2+\xi^2}} \equiv N_\nu T^4\, \hat{\rho}_\nu(\xi)\,. \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

This model for the neutrino gas is not thermodynamically consistent by itself. (The CMB acts as a thermal background prescribing mass and inheriting its temperature to the neutrino gas.) Conservation of energy in an expanding Universe thus must be imposed onto the total energy density and pressure: $\rho \to \rho_{\mathrm{tot}} = \rho + \rho_\nu$ and $P \to P_{\mathrm{tot}} = P + P_\nu$ in Eq. (7). The model of Eqs. (18) exhibits energy density and pressure which both are proportional to T^4 like the CMB does (the photonic part of $\mathrm{SU}(2)_{\mathrm{CMB}}$ or the entire $\mathrm{SU}(2)_{\mathrm{CMB}}$ for $T \gg T_0$). That is, for $T \gg T_0$, the ratio $\frac{P_{\mathrm{tot}}}{\rho_{\mathrm{tot}}} \equiv \kappa$ is independent of T. It reads

$$\kappa = \frac{\frac{1}{3} + \frac{15}{4\pi^2} N_\nu \hat{P}_\nu(\xi)}{1 + \frac{15}{4\pi^2} N_\nu \hat{\rho}_\nu(\xi)}\,, \quad (T \gg T_0)\,. \tag{19}$$

Fig. 4 depicts κ as a function of ξ for $T \gg T_0$ and $N_\nu = 3$. Because of the small deviation $\epsilon \equiv \frac{1}{3} - \kappa$, reaching its maximal value $\epsilon_{\max} = 0.0315$ at $\xi = 2.77$, the high-temperature scaling of this combination of $\mathrm{SU}(2)_{\mathrm{CMB}}$ with $N_\nu = 3$ temperature dependent massive neutrino flavours exhibits only weak deviations from conformal scaling,

$$\frac{T}{T_p} = a^{-1+\frac{3}{4}\epsilon}\,, \qquad (T \geq T_p;\, T_p \gg T_0;\, a(T_p) = 1)\,, \tag{20}$$

where T_p denotes a pivotal temperature within the high-temperature regime.

Let us now determine the value of ξ such that todays's value of $N_{\mathrm{eff}}(\xi)$, defined as

$$N_{\mathrm{eff}}(\xi) = \frac{N_\nu \hat{\rho}_\nu(\xi)}{\frac{7}{8}\frac{\pi^2}{15}\left(\frac{4}{11}\right)^{4/3}}\,, \tag{21}$$

matches $N_{\mathrm{eff}} = 3.36$, the value observationally determined in [8]. We find

$$\xi = 3.973\,, \tag{22}$$



Figure 4: The equation-of-state parameter κ for the model of $\mathrm{SU}(2)_{\mathrm{CMB}}$ combined with $N_\nu = 3$ temperature dependent massive neutrino flavours, see Eq. (18), as a function of ξ for $T \gg T_0$. Note the smallness of the deviation from $\kappa = \frac{1}{3}$, corresponding to the equation of state of a free gas of massless particles. The minimum of κ (or maximal deviation from $\kappa = \frac{1}{3}$) takes place at $\xi = 2.77$. For comparison, the maximum of the blackbody spectral energy density occurs at $\frac{\omega}{T} = 2.82$.

which is to the right of the minimum in Fig. 4. This corresponds to $\epsilon = 0.0263$. In Fig. 5 we show in analogy to Fig. 3 how scaling violation occurs in $\mathrm{SU}(2)_{\mathrm{CMB}}$ combined with $N_\nu = 3$ temperature dependent massive neutrino flavours ($\xi = 3.973$). In contrast to the case of pure $\mathrm{SU}(2)_{\mathrm{CMB}}$ there is a violation of conformal U(1) scaling also for $T \gg T_0$. This is expressed by Eq. (20). .

Employing Eq. (20) with $T_p = 6.8\,T_0$, we now estimate, in analogy to Sec. 3.4, the redshift z_{dec} at CMB decoupling as

$$z_{\mathrm{dec}} = 10\left(\frac{3000}{6.8\times 2.725}\right)^{\frac{1}{1-\frac{3}{4}\epsilon}} - 1 = 1793.5\,. \tag{23}$$

Interestingly, this value of z_{dec} differs from $z_{\mathrm{dec}} = 1775$, obtained for the case of pure $\mathrm{SU}(2)_{\mathrm{CMB}}$ (see Eq. (12)), by only 1%.

What about the redshift z_{re} for instantaneous reionisation? The same reasoning as in Sec. 3.3 but now subject to the modified scaling of Eq. (20) yields the following expression

$$a_{\mathrm{re}} = \frac{1}{10}\left(\frac{6.8\,T_0}{T_{\mathrm{re}}}\right)^{\frac{1}{1-\frac{3}{4}\epsilon}} = 0.0970862 \quad \Rightarrow \quad z_{\mathrm{re}} = a_{\mathrm{re}}^{-1} - 1 = 9.3\,, \tag{24}$$

where $T_{\mathrm{re}} = 7\times T_0$. This value of z_{re} remains compatible with the one extracted by the Planck collaboration using the CMB and gravitational lensing only, $z_{\mathrm{re}} = 10.8\pm^{3.1}_{2.5}$ [8], it differs from $z_{\mathrm{re}} = 10.29$, obtained for the case of pure $\mathrm{SU}(2)_{\mathrm{CMB}}$ (see Eq. (11)), by -9.6%, and it is at slight tension with the value $z_{\mathrm{re}} \sim 11.3 \pm 1.1$ obtained from combined (conventional) CMB and BAO analysis.



Figure 5: Violation of conformal scaling as induced by $\mathrm{SU}(2)_{\mathrm{CMB}}$ combined with $N_\nu = 3$ temperature dependent massive neutrino flavours. Left panel: $\frac{T_0}{T}$ as a function of scale factor a for this model (dashed line) and for a conventional U(1) photon theory (solid line). Right panel: $\frac{T}{T_0} \times a^{1-\frac{3}{4}\epsilon}$, compare with Eq. (20), as a function of scale factor a for this model. Saturation to $\frac{T}{T_0} \times a^{1-\frac{3}{4}\epsilon} = 0.71$ occurs for $a < 1/10$ which is consistent with $\frac{T}{T_0} = 6.8$ at $a = 1/10$ and $\epsilon = 0.0263$.

6 Summary and Conclusions

In this work we have put into perspective consequences of the postulate that a pure SU(2) Yang-Mills theory, posessing a critical temperature T_c for the deconfining-preconfining phase transition which coincides with the present temperature $T_0 = 2.725\,\mathrm{K}$ of the CMB [12], describes the cosmological evolution of the CMB. The here addressed physics, which only appeals to the free quasiparticle level in describing thermodynamical quantities in the deconfining phase of $\mathrm{SU}(2)_{\mathrm{CMB}}$, is much more basic than $\mathrm{SU}(2)_{\mathrm{CMB}}$'s imprint on large-angle anisotropies due to particular radiative corrections [26]. We have also addressed how the $\mathrm{SU}(2)_{\mathrm{CMB}}$ scenario could affect cosmic neutrinos. An apparently viable scenario, where, by interacting with the CMB, cosmic neutrinos stream at CMB temperature T and acquire a mass $\propto T$, does not qualitatively change the prediction for z_{dec} (redshift at which CMB decouples) and for the redshift value z_{re} of instantaneous reionisation, the latter simulated under a conventional, conformal scaling assumption *and* $\mathrm{SU}(2)_{\mathrm{CMB}}$. This is done by conventionally relating the value $z_{\mathrm{re}} \sim 6$, extracted from quasar spectra, to the value of T, and by subsequently computing from this the associated $\mathrm{SU}(2)_{\mathrm{CMB}}$ redshift. The latter happens to be compatible with the value extracted by the Planck collaboration using the CMB and gravitational lensing only.

$\mathrm{SU}(2)_{\mathrm{CMB}}$ predicts a violation of the simple $T \propto a^{-1}$ scaling at low redshift which moves z_{dec} from $z_{\mathrm{dec}} \sim 1100$ to $z_{\mathrm{dec}} \sim 1800$. To keep, at CMB decoupling, the ratio of thermal photon energy density to matter density unchanged, matter density would have to be rescaled by a factor $\left(\frac{1100}{1800}\right)^3 \sim 0.23$ yielding a new Ω_m of about 7 %. This, however, is close to the present baryonic density ($\sim 5.5\,\%$). At high redshifts

the validity of the ΛCDM concordance model is thus questioned. In a cosmological model void of dark matter, the strong Ω_m component seen in cosmologically local signatures (luminosity distance - redshift curves, large-scale structure surveys) could be an indication of the onset of coherent oscillations of a homogeneous dark-energy field at late times [33], and conventional dark-matter halos, thought to be responsible for the flattening of galaxy rotation curves, could be mimicked by (topologically stabilised) solitonic configurations of such a field.

To rule out or strengthen the here proposed scenario for CMB and cosmic neutrino physics, dedicated simulations of the implied cosmological model are required resting on data from both local cosmology and the CMB angular correlation functions.

Acknowledgments

We would like to acknowledge useful conversations with Julian Moosmann. We also thank the organisers of *Cosmology and Fundamental Physics with Planck* at CERN (June 2013) for an insightful event. This paper is dedicated to the memory of *Pierre van Baal* and *Dmitri Diakonov* who both were exceptionally gifted and committed theoretical physicists, contributing important pieces to the development of Quantum Yang-Mills theory.

References

[1] K. Abazajian et al., Astron. J. **126**, 2081 (2003).

[2] J. K. Adelman-McCarthy et al., Astrophys. J. S **175**, 297 (2008).

[3] J. C. Mather et al., Astrophys. J. **354**, L37 (1990)

[4] G. F. Hinshaw et.al., Astrophys. J. **208**, 19H (2013).

[5] P. A. R. Ade et al., arXiv:1303.5062v2 (2013).

[6] S. Perlmutter et al.. Astrophys. J. **517**, 565 (1998).

[7] A. Riess et al., Astron. J. **116**, 1009 (1998).

[8] P. A. R. Ade et al., arXiv:1303.5076v3 (2013).

[9] P. A. R. Ade et al., arXiv:1303.5083v3 (2013).

[10] P. Vielva, Adv. Astron. **2010**, 592094 (2010).

[11] M. Tegmark, A. de Oliveira-Costa, and A. J. Hamilton, Phys. Rev. D **68**, 123523 (2003); A. De Oliveira-Costa et al., Phys. Rev. D **69**, 063516 (2004); C. J. Copi et al., Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc. **367**, 79 (2006); C. J. Copi et al., Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc. **434**, 3590 (2013).

[12] R. Hofmann, *The Thermodynamics of Quantum Yang-Mills Theory: Theory and Applications*, World Scientific (2012).

[13] R. H. Becker et al., Astron. J. **122**, 2850 (2001).

[14] J. Moosmann and R. Hofmann, ISRN Math. Phys. **2012**, Article ID 236783 (2012).

[15] B. J. Harrington and H. K. Shepard, Phys. Rev. D **17**, 2122 (1977).

[16] G. 't Hooft, Phys. Rev. D **14**, 3432 (1976); Erratum-ibid. Phys. Rev. D **18**, 2199 (1978).

[17] M. Schwarz, R. Hofmann, and F. Giacosa, F., Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **22**, 1213 (2007).

[18] R. Hofmann, Ann. d. Phys. **18**, 634 (2009).

[19] J. Ludescher, F. Giacosa, and R. Hofmann, Annalen d. Physik **19**, 102 (2009).

[20] W. Nahm in *Trieste Group Theor. Method 1983*, p. 189 (1993).

[21] T. C. Kraan and P. Van Baal, Phys. Lett. B **428**, 268 (1998); T. C. Kraan and P. Van Baal, Nucl. Phys. B **533**, 627 (1998).

[22] K. Lee and C. Lu, Phys. Rev. D **58**, 025011-1 (1998).

[23] D. Diakonov et al., Phys. Rev. D **70**, 036003, (2004).

[24] D.J. Fixsen et al, Astrophys. J. **734**, 5 (2011).

[25] N. Fornengo, R. A. Lineros, M. Regis, and M. Taoso, JCAP **04**, 008 (2014).

[26] R. Hofmann, Nature Phys. **9**, 686 (2013).

[27] R. Hofmann, EPJ Web Conf. **71**, 00054 (2014).

[28] C. Falquez, R. Hofmann, and T. Baumbach, Quant. Matt. **1**, 153 (2012).

[29] J. Beringer et al. (Particle Data Group), Phys. Rev. D **86**, 010001 (2012).

[30] J. Lesgourges and S. Pastor, New J. Phys. **16**, 065002 (2014).

[31] D. V. Forero, M. Tortola, and J. W. F. Valle, Phys. Rev. D **86**, 073012 (2012).

[32] J. Moosmann and R. Hofmann, ISRN Math. Phys. **2012**, 601749 (2012).

[33] F. Giacosa and R. Hofmann, Eur. Phys. J. C **50**, 635 (2007).